

I want to thank Chairman SMITH, Ranking Member EVANS, and my colleagues on the Veterans' Affairs Committee for supporting the inclusion of provisions from H.R. 1929, the Native American Veterans Home Loan Act of 2001, in H.R. 2540. Ranking Member EVANS, fourteen other Members and I introduced H.R. 1929 on May 21st of this year to extend the Native American Veterans Home Loan Pilot Program for another four years, and expedite the process of obtaining VA home loans for Native American Veterans living on tribal and trust lands. This program helps many Native Americans Veterans who might otherwise be unable to obtain suitable housing. Including the important provisions of H.R. 1929 in H.R. 2540 will allow other Native American Veterans to take advantage of this important program.

The Native American Veterans Home Loan Pilot Program, however, is just one of many VA benefits improved through H.R. 2540. I ask my colleagues to join me in support of these important benefit enhancements for the men and women who have sacrificed so much in defense of liberty and democracy.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank all of my colleagues for their participation in this debate in helping to craft what I think is a very worthwhile bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2540, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2505, HUMAN CLONING PROHIBITION ACT OF 2001

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 214 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 214

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2505) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit human cloning. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendments recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be consid-

ered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Scott of Virginia or his designee, which shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; (3) after disposition of the amendment by Representative Scott, the further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Greenwood of Pennsylvania or his designee, shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (4) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Rules met and granted a structured rule for H.R. 2505, the Human Cloning Prohibition Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate in the House equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against the bill. The rule provides that the amendments recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The rule makes in order the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the rule if offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) or a designee which shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The rule makes in order after disposition of the Scott amendment the further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the rule if offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) or a designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule which will permit a thorough discussion of all the relevant issues. In fact, Members came before the Committee on Rules

yesterday and testified on two amendments. This rule allows for both of those amendments to be heard. The first of these amendments is the Greenwood substitute which allows human cloning for medical purposes. I oppose the Greenwood amendment because it is wrong to create human embryo farms, even for scientific research. The Committee on Rules, though, recognizes that the gentleman from Pennsylvania's proposal is the leading alternative to a ban on human cloning. Because we are aiming for a fair and thorough debate, we should make it in order on the House floor.

The second amendment is a proposal by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) to fund a study on human cloning. Again because the Committee on Rules recognizes the importance of this issue and wants a fair and open debate, we have decided that the gentleman from Virginia's study deserves House consideration.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) said in our Rules Committee meeting yesterday, this is an extremely important and a very complex issue.

□ 1315

Science is on the verge of cloning human embryos for both medical and reproductive purposes. Congress cannot face a weightier issue than the ethics of human cloning, and Congress should not run away from this problem. It is our job to address such pressing moral dilemmas, and it is our job to do so in a deliberative way. We do so today.

This bill and this rule represent the best of Congress. The Committee on the Judiciary held days of hearings on the Human Cloning Prohibition Act, with the Nation's leading scientists and ethicists. Today, this rule allows for floor consideration of the two most important challenges to the human cloning bill of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON.) If we wait to act, human cloning will go forward unregulated, with frightening and ghoulish consequences.

I have spent a lot of time considering this issue, because it is so complex; and I have decided to vote to ban human cloning. It is simply wrong to clone human beings. It is wrong to create fully grown tailor-made cloned babies, and it is wrong to clone human embryos to experiment on and destroy them. Anything other than a ban on human cloning would license the most ghoulish and dangerous enterprise in human history.

Some of us can still remember how the world was repulsed during and after World War II by the experiments conducted by the Nazis in the war. How is this different?

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and I urge my colleagues to support the underlying measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.